

## REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

By the current Amendment, claim 21 has been amended and claim 41 has been added.

In the Final Rejection mailed May 4, 2004, claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Claims 21, 27-31, 33-36 and 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al., and further in view of Iwanaga et al. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al., and further in view of Rainer. Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al., and further in view of Kent et al. Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al. and Kent et al., and further in view of Swift et al. Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al., Kent et al., and Swift et al., and further in view of "Paste for electronic materials". Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al., and further in view of Maeda et al. And, claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al., and further in view of Tannas, Jr.

Also in the Advisory Action mailed September 29, 2004, the Examiner stated that the Request for Reconsideration filed August 4, 2004, was sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraph, rejections of claim 39, and thus these rejections would not be maintained. However, in the Advisory Action the Examiner also expressed that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections would be maintained. Accordingly, in an effort to further distinguish the instant invention from the references currently relied upon, claim 21 has been amended and the following discussion is provided.

The basic position taken by the Examiner is that moisture sensing resistive substance 6 of Nishijima et al. corresponds to the claimed "adhesive in which fine particles having hygroscopic features are mixed". In this regard, the Examiner further stated in the Advisory Action that it is inherent that a hygroscopic substance has hygroscopic particles.

Without acquiescing to the appropriateness of these positions taken by the Examiner, and solely to further advance prosecution of this application, claim 21 has been amended in an effort to prevent the Examiner from reading the claimed adhesive and hygroscopic particles on substance 6 of Nishijima et al. In this regard, claim 21 has been amended to require that **the fine particles having hygroscopic features are of a material different than a material of the adhesive**. Support for this amendment can be found in the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the original specification, for example. It is respectfully submitted that even if the moisture sensing resistive substance 6 of Nishijima et al. is an adhesive, and even if this adhesive does include hygroscopic particles, an adhesive including hygroscopic particles as now recited in amended claim 21 is not taught or suggested by Nishijima et al.

Specifically, in Nishijima et al., the resistive substance 6 is disclosed to be of one of the polymers disclosed in column 7, lines 15-23 of this reference. These polymers are said to be themselves hygroscopic in nature, and accordingly, any hygroscopic particles therein are of the polymeric material. Thus, the “adhesive” of Nishijima et al. is the same as the hygroscopic particles thereof. Nishijima et al. does not disclose to be mixed with the polymers any hygroscopic particles that are of a material different than that of the polymers. This is contrary to what is now recited in claim 21, which requires that the adhesive is different from the hygroscopic particles in terms of material.


Accordingly, because the moisture sensing resistive substance 6 and any hygroscopic particles of Nishijima et al. are of one and the same material, the adhesive mixed with fine hygroscopic particles of a different material, as now required by claim 21, is not taught or suggested by Nishijima et al. None of the other references resolve this deficiency of Nishijima et al., and accordingly, claim 21 is allowable over any of the references relied upon by the Examiner either taken alone or in combination. Thus, claims 21-41 are allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kiyohiro YOKOYAMA et al.

By:   
Joseph M. Gorski  
Registration No. 46,500  
Attorney for Applicants

JMG/edg  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
November 4, 2004